

SEARCY  
DENNEY  
SCAROLA  
BARNHART  
& SHIPLEY P.A.

*Attorneys  
at Law*

WEST PALM BEACH OFFICE:

2139 PALM BEACH LAKES BLVD.  
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA 33409

P.O. BOX 3626  
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA 33402

Spanish

TALLAHASSEE OFFICE:

THE TOWLE HOUSE  
517 NORTH CALHOUN STREET  
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32301-1231

P.O. BOX 1230  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

June 17, 2011

Joseph L. Ackerman, Jr., Esquire  
Fowler White Burnett, P.A.  
901 Phillips Point West  
777 S Flagler Drive  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401-6170

Re: Edwards adv. Epstein  
Our File No.: 291874

Dear Joe:

Although there is no obligation to respond to your voluntary response to our invocation of the provisions of F.S. §57.105, I cannot resist the urge to do so.

The claims against Bradley Edwards were a blatant effort at intimidation when they were filed by your predecessor counsel—a fact they apparently found the courage to recognize leading to their withdrawal. The claims had no good faith basis when originally filed, they have no good faith basis now, and your letter of June 16 only serves to confirm your recognition that you are on a fishing expedition designed to harass Mr. Edwards while you search to piece together fragments of suspicion into a cover for Mr. Epstein's misconduct.

Scott Rothstein's crimes are not a substitute for evidence against Bradley Edwards. The complicity of others in Rothstein's crimes is not a substitute for evidence against Bradley Edwards. The damage sustained by the victim's of Rothstein's crimes is not a substitute for evidence that Epstein was damaged by Bradley Edwards beyond Epstein's self-inflicted damage of being obliged to pay for his own aberrant victimization of children.

You have no viable theory of damages. You have no evidence of any act on the part of Bradley Edwards other than the vigorous and successful prosecution of legitimate claims on behalf of his clients. You have no basis for seeking to prosecute affirmative



WWW.SEARCYLAW.COM

EFTA01120028


Edwards adv. Epstein  
Joseph L. Ackerman, Esquire  
June 17, 2011  
Page 2

claims while your client attempts to hide behind the shield of the Fifth Amendment. You have no excuse for persisting in the assertion of the right to remain silent in the context of this litigation while your client is shooting his mouth off with self-serving public statements and not-so-private threats.

As to your comments regarding discovery, the disclosure of documents to others (in the context of a confidentiality agreement that recognizes common interests) proves that Bradley Edwards has nothing to hide from anyone. However, Mr. Epstein is a vicious, unscrupulous, filthy rich adversary who cannot and will not be trusted with anything except that which the law entitles him to have when and only when the law says he is entitled to get it.

You and your firm have been seduced by Mr. Epstein's nearly limitless resources and ensnared in his very dirty web. Fortunately for you, you have the power to break free if you choose to.

Sincerely,



JACK SCAROLA  
JS/mep

cc: Bradley J. Edwards, Esq.

